

March 4, 2003

TO: Internal File

THRU: Daron R. Haddock, Permit Supervisor

FROM: Gregg A. Galecki, Reclamation Specialist III

RE: 2002 Third Quarter Water Monitoring, Nevada Electric Investment Co.,
Wellington Prep Plant, C/007/012-WQ02-3

- 1. Was data submitted for all of the MRP required sites?** YES [☒] NO [☐]
Identify sites not monitored and reason why, if known:

Data was submitted for all surface-water, groundwater, and UPDES sites.

- 2. On what date does the MRP require a five-year resampling of baseline water data.**
*Renewal of the permit is December 10, 2004. The MRP commits to sampling
baseline water parameters one year prior to the renewal date.*

Resampling due date 12/10/04

- 3. Were all required parameters reported for each site?** YES [☐] NO [☒]

At Well GW-13, only depth to water was collected. GW-13 has very slow recovery. When initially pumped, the well produces less than a liter of water; barely enough to collect field parameters since August 2000. Since 4th quarter 2001, following the initial purging of the well the water does not recover sufficiently to collect enough water to collected field parameters. When allowing a day to recover, the well still does not produce any measurable water. GW-13 is located in a non-essential water monitoring area since the surface facilities no longer exist in the area. It is recommended that the site be removed from the Water Monitoring Plan.

4. Were irregularities found in the data? YES [x] NO []

The wells located east-northeast of the Price River showing a drop in water levels since June 1999 (with the exception of wells GW-16 and GW-6 which are located in alluvium), generally stabilized during the 3rd quarter. No changes in water quality have been observed with this increase in the potentiometric surface.

At Well GW-7, located in the southwest portion of the permit area and showing a marked improvement in the amount of sulfate (SO₄) and total dissolved solids (TDS) since 1998 appears to have stabilized. Both SO₄ and TDS have decreased by approximately 35 percent from approximately 2300 mg/l to 1500 mg/l SO₄, and approximately 4300 mg/l to 2600 mg/l TDS, respectively.

No other irregularities were found in the third (3rd) quarter data.

5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?

1st month, YES [x] NO []
2nd month, YES [x] NO []
3rd month, YES [x] NO []

Sites 003 through 008 had documentation for a site visits every month. Beginning in the 3rd quarter 2002, Operators have been asked to submit DMR data electronically to the Division.

6. Were all required DMR parameters reported? YES [x] NO []

All sites were dry so no parameters were submitted

7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data? YES [] NO [x]

All sites were dry so no parameters were submitted

8. Based on your review, what further actions, if any, do you recommend?

No further action is necessary for the 2002 02-3 (3rd) Quarter Water Monitoring data.